# Control for Mobile Robots



**Christopher Batten**

Maslab IAP Robotics Course
January 7, 2005

# Building a control system for a mobile robot can be very challenging

Mobile robots are very complex and involve many interacting components



Mechanical



Electrical



Software

**Your control system must integrate these components so that your robot can achieve the desired goal**

# Building a control system for a mobile robot can be very challenging

Just as you must carefully **design** your robot chassis you must carefully **design** your robot control system

- How will you debug and test your robot?
- What are the performance requirements?
- Can you easily improve aspects of your robot?
- Can you easily integrate new functionality?

# Basic primitive of a control system is a behavior

**Behaviors should be well-defined, self-contained, and independently testable**



Turn right 90°



Go forward until reach obstacle



Capture a ball



Explore playing field

# Key objective is to compose behaviors so as to achieve the desired goal



# Outline

- High-level control system paradigms
  - Model-Plan-Act Approach
  - Behavioral Approach
  - Finite State Machine Approach
- Low-level control loops
  - PID controller for motor velocity
  - PID controller for robot drive system

# Model-Plan-Act Approach




1. Use sensor data to create model of the world
2. Use model to form a sequence of behaviors which will achieve the desired goal
3. Execute the plan

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Red dot is the mobile robot
while the blue line is the mousehole

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Robot uses sensors to create local map of the world and identify unexplored areas

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Robot moves to midpoint of unexplored boundary

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Robot performs a second sensor scan and must align the new data with the global map

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Robot continues to explore the playing field

# Exploring the playing field using model-plan-act approach



Robot must recognize when it starts to see areas which it has already explored

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



Given the global map,
the goal is to find the mousehole

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



Transform world into configuration space by convolving robot with all obstacles

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



Decompose world into convex cells

Trajectory within any cell is free of obstacles

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



Connect cell edge midpoints and centroids to get graph of all possible paths

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



Use an algorithm (such as the A* algorithm) to find shortest path to goal

# Finding a mousehole using model-plan-act approach



The choice of cell decomposition can greatly influence results

# Advantages and disadvantages of the model-plan-act approach

- Advantages
  - Global knowledge in the model enables optimization
  - Can make provable guarantees about the plan
- Disadvantages
  - Must implement all functional units before any testing
  - Computationally intensive
  - Requires very good sensor data for accurate models
  - Models are inherently an approximation
  - Works poorly in dynamic environments

# Behavioral Approach




As in simple biological systems,
behaviors directly couple sensors and actuators

Higher level behaviors are layered
on top of lower level behaviors

# To illustrate the behavioral approach we will consider a simple mobile robot



# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






Cruise behavior simply moves robot forward

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






Left motor speed inversely proportional to left IR range
Right motor speed inversely proportional to right IR range
If both IR < threshold stop and turn right 120 degrees

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






Escape behavior stops motors,
backs up a few inches, and turns right 90 degrees

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






The track ball behavior adjusts the motor differential to steer the robot towards the ball

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






Hold ball behavior simply closes ball gate when ball switch is depressed

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






The track goal behavior opens the ball gate and adjusts the motor differential to steer the robot towards the goal

# Layering simple behaviors can create much more complex emergent behavior






All behaviors are always running in parallel and an arbiter is responsible for picking which behavior can access the actuators

# Advantages and disadvantages of the behavioral approach

- Advantages
  - Incremental development is very natural
  - Modularity makes experimentation easier
  - Cleanly handles dynamic environments
- Disadvantages
  - Difficult to judge what robot will actually do
  - No performance or completeness guarantees
  - Debugging can be very difficult

# Model-plan-act fuses sensor data, while behavioral fuses behaviors




Model-Plan-Act
(Fixed Plan of Behaviors)




Behavioral
(Layered Behaviors)

# Model-plan-act fuses sensor data, while behavioral fuses behaviors




Model-Plan-Act
(Sensor Fusion)




Behavioral
(Behavior Fusion)

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors




**Fwd** behavior moves robot straight forward a given distance




**TurnR** behavior turns robot to the right a given number of degrees

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Each state is just a behavior and we can easily link them together to create an open loop control system

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Each state is just a behavior and we can easily link them together to create an open loop control system

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Each state is just a behavior and we can easily link them together to create an open loop control system

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Each state is just a behavior and we can easily link them together to create an open loop control system

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Since the Maslab playing field is unknown, open loop control systems have no hope of success!

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Closed loop finite state machines use sensor data as feedback to make state transitions

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Closed loop finite state machines use sensor data as feedback to make state transitions

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Closed loop finite state machines use sensor data as feedback to make state transitions

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Closed loop finite state machines use sensor data as feedback to make state transitions

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Closed loop finite state machines use sensor data as feedback to make state transitions

# Implementing a FSM in Java




```
// State transitions
switch ( state ) {

  case States.Fwd_1 :
    if ( distanceToObstacle() < 2 )
      state = TurnR_45;
    break;

  case States.TurnR_45 :
    if ( distanceToObstacle() >= 2 )
      state = Fwd_1;
    break;

}

// State outputs
switch ( state ) {

  case States.Fwd_1 :
    moveFoward(1); break;

  case States.TurnR_45 :
    turnRight(45); break;

}
```

# Implementing a FSM in Java

- Implement behaviors as parameterized functions
- First switch statement handles state transitions
- Second switch statement executes behaviors associated with each state
- Use enums for state variables

```
// State transitions
switch ( state ) {

  case States.Fwd_1 :
    if ( distanceToObstacle() < 2 )
      state = TurnR_45;
    break;

  case States.TurnR_45 :
    if ( distanceToObstacle() >= 2 )
      state = Fwd_1;
    break;

}

// State outputs
switch ( state ) {

  case States.Fwd_1 :
    moveFoward(1); break;

  case States.TurnR_45 :
    turnRight(45); break;

}
```

# Finite State Machines offer another alternative for combining behaviors






Can also fold closed loop feedback into the behaviors themselves

# Simple finite state machine to locate red balls



# Simple finite state machine to locate red balls



# To debug a FSM control system verify behaviors and state transitions



# To debug a FSM control system verify behaviors and state transitions



# Improve FSM control system by replacing a state with a better implementation




**Could replace random wander with one which is biased towards unexplored regions**

# Improve FSM control system by replacing a state with a better implementation

What about integrating camera code into wander behavior so robot is always looking for red balls?

- Image processing is time consuming so might not check for obstacles until too late
- Not checking camera when rotating
- Wander behavior begins to become monolithic

```
ball = false
turn both motors on
while ( !timeout and !ball )
  capture and process image
  if ( red ball ) ball = true

  read IR sensor
  if ( IR < thresh )
    stop motors
    rotate 90 degrees
    turn both motors on
  endif

endwhile
```

# Multi-threaded
# finite state machine control systems



# Multi-threaded
# finite state machine control systems






# Multi-threaded
# finite state machine control systems



# Multi-threaded
# finite state machine control systems



# FSMs in Maslab

**Finite state machines can combine the model-plan-act and behavioral approaches and are a good starting point for your Maslab robotic control system**

# Outline

- High-level control system paradigms
  - Model-Plan-Act Approach
  - Behavioral Approach
  - Finite State Machine Approach
- **Low-level control loops**
  - **PID controller for motor velocity**
  - **PID controller for robot drive system**

# Problem: How do we set a motor to a given velocity?

Open Loop Controller

- Use trial and error to create some kind of relationship between velocity and voltage
- Changing supply voltage or drive surface could result in incorrect velocity





# Problem: How do we set a motor to a given velocity?

Closed Loop Controller

- Feedback is used to adjust the voltage sent to the motor so that the actual velocity equals the desired velocity
- Can use an optical encoder to measure actual velocity





# Step response with no controller




- Naive velocity to volts
- Model motor with several differential equations
- Slow rise time
- Stead-state offset



# Step response with proportional controller




$$X = V_{des} + K_P \cdot (V_{des} - V_{act})$$

- Big error big = big adj
- Faster rise time
- Overshoot
- Stead-state offset



# Step response with proportional-derivative controller




$$X = V_{des} + K_P e(t) - K_D \frac{de(t)}{dt}$$

- When approaching desired velocity quickly, de/dt term counteracts proportional term slowing adjustment
- Faster rise time
- Reduces overshoot



# Step response with proportional-integral controller




$$X = V_{des} + K_P e(t) - K_I \int e(t)\ dt$$

- Integral term eliminates accumulated error
- Increases overshoot



# Step response with PID controller




$$X = V_{des} + K_P e(t) + K_I \int e(t)\, dt - K_D \frac{de(t)}{dt}$$



# Choosing and tuning a controller




- Use the simplest controller which achieves the desired result
- Tuning PID constants is very tricky, especially for integral constants
- Consult the literature for more controller tips and techniques

# Problem: How do we make our robots go in a nice straight line?







Model differential drive with slight motor mismatch

With an open loop controller, setting motors to same velocity results in a less than straight trajectory

# Problem: How do we make our robots go in a nice straight line?

**Trajectory**




**Motor Velocities vs Time**




With an independent PID controller for each motor,
setting motors to same velocity results in a straight trajectory
but not necessarily straight ahead!

# Problem: How do we make our robots go in a nice straight line?

- Need to couple drive motors
  - Use low-level PID controllers to set motor velocity and a high-level PID controller to couple the motors
  - Use one high-level PID controller which uses odometry or even image processing to estimate error



# Problem: How do we make our robots go in a nice straight line?

Need to couple drive motors

- Use low-level PID controllers to set motor velocity and a high-level PID controller to couple the motors
- Use one high-level PID controller which uses odometry or even image processing to estimate error



# Take Away Points

- Integrating **feedback** into your control system "closes the loop" and is essential for creating robust robots
- Simple **finite state machines** make a solid starting point for your Maslab control systems
- Spend time this weekend **designing behaviors** and deciding how you will **integrate** these behaviors to create your control system